

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

TYRONE NOEL NUNN,

Case No. 3:23-cv-00466-MMD-CSD

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

UMC-CCDC DISTRICT OF NEVADA, *et al.*,Defendants.**I. SUMMARY**

Plaintiff Tyrone Noel Nunn initiated this case without filing a complaint, filing an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), or paying the \$402 filing fee. On February 20, 2024, this Court ordered Nunn to file a complete complaint and either file an application to proceed IFP or pay the \$402 filing fee in full by March 18, 2024. (ECF No. 8.) That deadline passed, and Nunn has not filed a complaint, filed an IFP application, paid the \$402 filing fee, requested an extension, or otherwise responded to the Court's February 20, 2024, order.

**II. DISCUSSION**

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party's failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. See *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the public's

1 interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court's need to manage its docket;  
 2 (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of  
 3 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. See *In re  
 4 Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting  
 5 *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130).

6 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation  
 7 and the Court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of Nunn's  
 8 claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal  
 9 because a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing  
 10 a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542  
 11 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor, the public policy favoring disposition of  
 12 cases on their merits, is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

13 The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can  
 14 be used to correct the party's failure that brought about the Court's need to consider  
 15 dismissal. See *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining  
 16 that considering less drastic alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order  
 17 does not satisfy this factor); *accord Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th  
 18 Cir. 2002) (explaining that "the persuasive force of" earlier Ninth Circuit cases that  
 19 "implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic alternatives prior to disobedience of the court's  
 20 order as satisfying this element[,]” i.e., like the "initial granting of leave to amend coupled  
 21 with the warning of dismissal for failure to comply[,]” have been "eroded" by *Yourish*).  
 22 Courts "need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a  
 23 case, but must explore possible and meaningful alternatives." *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779  
 24 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed until and  
 25 unless Nunn files a complaint and either files a fully complete application to proceed *in  
 26 forma pauperis* or pays the \$402 filing fee for a civil action, the only alternative is to enter  
 27 another order setting another deadline. But the reality of repeating an ignored order is  
 28 that it often only delays the inevitable and squanders the Court's finite resources. The

1 circumstances here do not indicate that this case will be an exception: there is no hint  
2 that Nunn needs additional time or evidence that he did not receive the Court's order.  
3 Setting another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these circumstances. So  
4 the fifth factor favors dismissal.

5 In sum, having thoroughly considered the dismissal factors, the Court finds that  
6 they weigh in favor of dismissal.

7 **III. CONCLUSION**

8 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on  
9 Nunn's failure to file a complaint and failure to file either a fully complete application to  
10 proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$402 filing fee in compliance with the Court's  
11 February 20, 2024, order.

12 The Clerk of Court is further directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this  
13 case. No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case. If Nunn wishes to pursue  
14 his claims, he must file a complaint in a new case.

15 DATED THIS 10<sup>th</sup> Day of June 2025.

16  
17   
18 MIRANDA M. DU  
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28